



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,661

12/16/2003

Akihiro Miyazaki

2003_1820

2854

513

7590

08/20/2009

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.

1030 15th Street, N.W.,

Suite 400 East

Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, STEVEN H D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/735,661	Applicant(s) MIYAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven HD Nguyen	Art Unit 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 79-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 79-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/4/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 79-86 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6914903 in view of Broughton (US 5131016) and MacCriskin (USP 4730348).

As claims 79 and 83, The claims of patent discloses all limitations of the presented claims excepting for setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information; and subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet

Art Unit: 2416

received. In the same field of endeavor, Broughton discloses setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 5:27-48, receiving data packet for setting a decompression table using a predetermined data at beginning of the session; during the session the nodes can change the compression method). However, claimed patent and Broughton fail to disclose subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, MacCriskin discloses subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received (Col. 9, lines 49-55, receiving data packet "specific packet" includes an updated compression, setting a decompression table using this updated information to decompress a new data packet wherein the specific data packet is decompressed by old decompress table).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for setting a compression table as disclosed by Broughton into MacCriskin for decompressing and updating the

decompression table every time a packet includes a update data into the patent. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

As claims 80-82 and 84-86, The patent claims do not disclose the use of header for conveying updated information at predetermined of number packets or period.

However, these steps are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply these steps into the patent claim in order to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

3. Claims 79-86 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6914903 in view of Broughton (US 5131016) and Geiger (USP 5701302).

As claims 79 and 83, The claims of patent discloses all limitations of the presented claims excepting for setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information; and subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, Broughton discloses setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 5:27-48, receiving data packet for setting a decompression table using a predetermined data at beginning of the session; during the session the nodes can change the compression method). However, claimed patent and Broughton fail to

Art Unit: 2416

disclose subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, Geiger discloses subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received (Fig 8, the second device received the data packets which includes at least on selected packet "specific packet" which includes a update expansion table which uses to expanse the second group of packets. Every time a specific packet is received, the expansion table will be updated).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for setting a compression table as disclosed by Broughton into Geiger for decompressing and updating the decompression table every time a packet includes a update data into the patent. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

As claims 80-82 and 84-86, The patent claims do not disclose the use of header for conveying updated information at predetermined of number packets or period. However, these steps are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2416

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply these steps into the patent claim in order to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 79 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy (US 5648773) in view of Broughton (US 5131016) and MacCriskin (USP 4730348).

As claims 79 and 83, Guy discloses data reception method for receiving, from a transmitting end, data in packet units, each packet unit containing transmission data, the packet units being received at a receiving end, said data receiving method comprising receiving an uncompressed packet in which predetermined transmission data is stored as uncompressed data (Fig 1, Col. 1, lines 34-50 and Col. 4, lines 5-10, receiving a packet includes parameters); subsequently and continuously receiving compressed packets in which at least a portion of transmission data, following the predetermined transmission data, is compressed and stored as compressed data (Fig 1, Receiver 20 will decompress the compressed packets and storing the data); restoring transmission data from a compressed packet to be restored, the transmission data being restored based on update information relating to a packet received prior to the compressed packet to be restored and based on compressed data included in the

Art Unit: 2416

received compressed packet to be restored (Fig 1, Receiver 20 decompresses the received compressed packet based on previous packet which belong to the negotiated phase); setting information relating to the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 4, lines 5-10, the parameters are used to initialization the receiver and transmitter). However, Guy fails to disclose setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information, subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, Broughton discloses setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 5:27-48, receiving data packet for setting a decompression table using a predetermined data at beginning of the session; during the session the nodes can change the compression method). However, Guy and Broughton fail to disclose subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, MacCriskin discloses subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the

Art Unit: 2416

transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received (Col. 9, lines 49-55, receiving data packet "specific packet" includes an updated compression, setting a decompression table using this updated information to decompress a new data packet wherein the specific data packet is decompressed by old decompress table).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for setting a compression table as disclosed by Broughton into MacCrisken for decompressing and updating the decompression table every time a packet includes a update data into Guys's system and method. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

6. Claims 80 and 84 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy and MacCrisken, Broughton as applied to claims 79 and 83 above, and further in view of Fink (US 6373986).

Guy, Broughton and MacCrisken fail to disclose the claimed invention. In the same field of endeavor, Fink discloses a header of packet used to convey updated data (F2A, S18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for using header for conveying data as disclosed by Fink into Broughton and MacCrisken and Guys's

Art Unit: 2416

system and method. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system

7. Claims 81-82 and 85-86 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy, Broughton and MacCrisken as applied to claims 79 and 83 above, and further in view of Kiriya.

Broughton and MacCrisken and Guys fail to disclose receiving the specific compressed packet at a predetermined interval and every time a predetermined number of compressed packets are received. In the same field of endeavor, Kiriya teaches to receiving compressed packet at a predetermined interval and predetermined number of compressed packets (column 1, line 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was

made to add functionality of receiving packets at predetermined regular interval and predetermined number of packets from Kiriya to the system of Broughton and MacCrisken and Guys in order to enhance accuracy in transmission.

8. Claims 79 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy (US 5648773) in view of Broughton (US 5131016) and **Geiger (USP 5701302)**.

As claims 79 and 83, Guy discloses data reception method for receiving, from a transmitting end, data in packet units, each packet unit containing transmission data, the packet units being received at a receiving end, said data receiving method comprising receiving an uncompressed packet in which predetermined transmission

Art Unit: 2416

data is stored as uncompressed data (Fig 1, Col. 1, lines 34-50 and Col. 4, lines 5-10, receiving a packet includes parameters); subsequently and continuously receiving compressed packets in which at least a portion of transmission data, following the predetermined transmission data, is compressed and stored as compressed data (Fig 1, Receiver 20 will decompress the compressed packets and storing the data); restoring transmission data from a compressed packet to be restored, the transmission data being restored based on update information relating to a packet received prior to the compressed packet to be restored and based on compressed data included in the received compressed packet to be restored (Fig 1, Receiver 20 decompresses the received compressed packet based on previous packet which belong to the negotiated phase); setting information relating to the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 4, lines 5-10, the parameters are used to initialization the receiver and transmitter). However, Guy fails to disclose setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information, subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, Broughton discloses setting the predetermined information data in the uncompressed packet as an initial value of the update information (Col. 5:27-48, receiving data packet for setting a decompression table using a predetermined data at beginning of the session; during the

Art Unit: 2416

session the nodes can change the compression method). However, Guy and Broughton fail to disclose subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received. In the same field of endeavor, **Geiger discloses subsequently updating the update information to information included in the transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet received (Fig 8, the second device received the data packets which includes at least on selected packet "specific packet" which includes a update expansion table which uses to expanse the second group of packets. Every time a specific packet is received, the expansion table will be updated).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for setting a compression table as disclosed by Broughton into Geiger for decompressing and updating the decompression table every time a packet includes a update data into Guys's system and method. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system.

Art Unit: 2416

9. Claims 80 and 84 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy and Broughton, Geiger as applied to claims 79 and 83 above, and further in view of Fink (US 6373986).

Guy, Broughton and Geiger fail to disclose the claimed invention. In the same field of endeavor, Fink discloses a header of packet used to convey updated data (F2A, S18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for using header for conveying data as disclosed by Fink into Broughton, Geiger and Guys's system and method. The motivation would have been to improve an adaptive compression method and system

10. Claims 81-82 and 85-86 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guy, Broughton and Geiger as applied to claims 79 and 83 above, and further in view of Kiriya.

Broughton, Geiger and Guys fail to disclose receiving the specific compressed packet at a predetermined interval and every time a predetermined number of compressed packets are received. In the same field of endeavor, Kiriya teaches to receiving compressed packet at a predetermined interval and predetermined number of compressed packets (column 1, line 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add functionality of receiving packets at predetermined regular interval and

Art Unit: 2416

predetermined number of packets from Kiriya to the system of Broughton, Geiger and Guys in order to enhance accuracy in transmission.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven HD Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yao Kwang can be reached on (571) 272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2416

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thursday, August 20, 2009

/Steven HD Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2416